



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/711,317

09/10/2004

Arash Massoudi

16906.1.1

5316

22913

7590

08/07/2008

WORKMAN NYDEGGER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/07/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/711,317 | Applicant(s) MASSOUDI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner BAOQUOC N. TO | Art Unit 2162 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/30/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 13, 20 and 31 are amended in the amendment filed on 01/04/2008.

Claims 13-37 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 04/30/2008. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 31-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. The indicated allowability of claims 31-37 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Wotring et al. (US Patent No. 6,665,667 B1). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2162

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wotring et al. (US. Patent No. 6,665,677 B1).

As to claim 31, Wotring discloses a computer program product for use in a system having a processor, the computer program product comprising a memory having computer readable program code stored thereon, the computer readable program code comprising computer executable instruction that, when executed by a processor, cause the computer program product to perform the following:

Map a relation and association between the leaf data element of a first data structure description and leaf data element of a second data structure description (mapping structure) (col. 6, lines 61-65);

Set data values of any leaf data element of the first data structure description in a first in-memory data component, the first in-memory data component being dynamically generated using a key generated from a key-based look-up molding technique, wherein the key is stored in a lookup table associated with the first in-memory data component (the id key value "offender #", a data value...) (col. 4, lines 48-55);

Get the data value of any leaf data element of the first data structure from the first in-memory data component using the key generated from the key-based

Art Unit: 2162

look-up molding technique (next item is retrieved, in the accordance with step 908) (col. 9, lines 65-67); and

Automatically transfer of the value from the first in-memory data component to a second in-memory data component (the final step in the transformation process of the current invention, then, is import process, in which data is transformed and transferred to the hierarchical database for storage and indexing) (col. 9, lines 21-24).

As to claim 32, Wotring discloses the method as recited in claim 31, wherein mapping a relation and association between leaf data elements of a first data structure description and leaf data elements of a second data structure description further comprises storing in memory the first data structure description in one or more lookup tables (the final step in the transformation process of the current invention, then, is import process, in which data is transformed and transferred to the hierarchical database for storage and indexing) (col. 9, lines 21-24).

As to claim 33, Wotring discloses the method as recited in claim 31, wherein the mapping description is expressed in a machine readable format using a unique path identifier with an absolute and relative path addressing scheme (the extracted field value is next run through any data formatting functions that are specified by the user) (col. 10, lines 39-41).

As to claim 34, Wotring discloses the method as recited in claim 31, wherein setting data values of any leaf data element of the first data structure

Art Unit: 2162

description in a first in-memory data component using a key-based look-up molding technique further comprises storing a key corresponding to each leaf data element in one or more lookup tables (the final step in the transformation process of the current invention, then, is import process, in which data is transformed and transferred to the hierarchical database for storage and indexing) (col. 9, lines 21-24).

As to claim 35, Wotring discloses the method as recited in claim 31, further comprising enforcing integrity of the data values while and after the data values are set (these may include any functions suitable for removing inconsistencies or inaccuracies from data after transfer from one data management system to another) (col. 10, lines 41-44).

As to claim 36, Wotring discloses the method as recited in claim 31, further comprising enforcing software interface integrity, data type validation and enforcing data type restrictions at runtime (these may include any functions suitable for removing inconsistencies or inaccuracies from data after transfer from one data management system to another) (col. 10, lines 41-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

Art Unit: 2162

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wotring et al. (US. Patent No. 6,665,677 B1) in view of Sasaki et al. (US. Patent No. 5,774,583).

As to claim 37, Wotring discloses the method as recited in claim 31 excepting for wherein the first data structure and the second data structure are both software services, wherein mapping a relation and association between leaf data elements of a first data structure description and leaf data elements of a second data structure description comprises mapping the outputs of the first software service with the inputs of the second software service; However, Sasaki discloses wherein the first data structure and the second data structure are both software services, wherein mapping a relation and association between leaf data elements of a first data structure description and leaf data elements of a second

Art Unit: 2162

data structure description comprises mapping the outputs of the first software service with the inputs of the second software service (second hierarchical processing means for recognizing first processing information output from the first hierarchical processing means to process code data output from the first hierarchical processing means and creating blocks by collecting the code data for each given unit and outputting the blocks) (col. 2, lines 15-20). This suggests the concept of processing the data from the output from the first set of data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine processing the data output from the first means into Wotring in order to allow the data to be processed from different data version.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 13-30 are allowed.

The reason for allowance was indicated in the last Office Action dated on 05/01/2008.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041, or unofficial fax number for the purpose of discussion (571) 273-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Art Unit: 2162

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(571) 273-8300 [Official Communication]

/Baoquoc N To/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

08/03/2008